
LaRouche on the Balkans

First define the peace objectives

What follows is a slightly edited segment of the Feb. 8 edition of "EIR Talks with Lyndon LaRouche," a radio interview conducted by Mel Klenetsky.

EIR: We are currently looking at a situation in the Balkans, which has something like 1.5 million Bosnian refugees, 200,000 people killed; there are rape camps and concentration camps, and heinous kinds of things taking place. Is military intervention the right policy for Bosnia at this point; and if so, is it similar to what the United States has been doing in, let's say, Somalia?

LaRouche: First of all, a military policy pure and simple is always a piece of idiocy. Because when you go out to shoot somebody, you say, what are you shooting him for? "Well, we have our objections to what he is doing, and that's a good enough reason for us to shoot him."

But we should know, by studying history—those of us who have: Never get into a war, unless you have first studied very carefully the issue of justified warfare as posed by St. Augustine in his writings on the subject.

Don't go so quickly into warfare. First of all, you have to define what your *peace objectives* are, and what the problems standing in the way of peace are, and your commitment to conduct war if at all for the purpose of furthering those peace objectives. Then you must state clearly what those peace objectives are, because your object of warfare is to bring about peace when peace in fact no longer exists.

Peace in fact no longer exists in the Balkans. The first thing to be done, which neither Cyrus Vance nor Lord David Owen have done, is to state, from the standpoint of *morality*, what is immoral in the situation in the Balkans and what are the moral conditions which must be satisfied to bring about peace.

Then, if you have to go to warfare, you say that we may have to go warfare. If we do so, it will be for the following *peaceful objectives*. And as soon as somebody accepts these peaceful objectives, the war is ended. And only under those conditions, is war a moral alternative. Even in desperate situations, you must not go to war, even to save your own life, unless you have met those conditions.

So, that's our situation in the Balkans. We have war

criminals who are worse than the Nazis under the command of Milosevic, the leader of the Serbian communist-fascist bloc (not the Serbians as a whole, but these people have dominated the Serbians with their machine and they are conducting the war).

It is genocide. We should call it *genocide*. It is aggressive war—we should call it that. We should state that we will not tolerate that. We should stop this nonsense about the Croats "provoking" the Serbs. We should send into something like Coventry [an insane asylum in Britain], people like Douglas Hurd, particularly Nicholas Ridley or Conor Cruise O'Brien, who say this war was started by Germany or said that there was a threat that Germany would become a Fourth Reich—a lot of nonsense. People who mouth that stuff, should be treated with contempt.

In other words, the first thing to do, is to organize political-moral force for the right peace objectives, and then, if there is no other way to do that but military means, and military means are capable of doing that, then do it. Because you have to. But we should prepare for that contingency. But what I fear is that some slopheads will get us into a shooting war with no clear workable peace objectives, and that would make a worse mess than we already have.

EIR: Is there anything in terms of the immediate situation that can be done? The Vance-Owen plan talks about a cantonization policy for Bosnia and there is opposition in Bosnia to that, and yet the Bosnians are facing a life and death situation. Should the embargo be lifted?

LaRouche: The United States government and the Europeans should simply say, that whatever Boutros Boutros-Ghali and his crew in the United Nations, along with Vance, think they are doing, in setting up a United Nations world empire, that we are not going to tolerate it.

We should say clearly what is the truth, that Vance and Owen, and Carrington before Owen, are worse criminals than Neville Chamberlain and Edouard Daladier at Munich in 1938. This is a far worse crime that Owen and Vance are doing—continuing the policy of Carrington—than was done by Neville Chamberlain and Edouard Daladier at Munich in 1938. We should treat that with contempt and give no moral support to it whatsoever: It stinks.

EIR: Would you say that the current policies in Somalia and the kind of thing that is being discussed for Haiti, are the right kind of policies?

LaRouche: No. [Deposed President Jean-Baptiste] Aristide is a criminal. We have all the evidence. Some people do not want to face it, because they are opportunists. But Aristide is the Pol Pot of Haiti. He committed crimes against humanity. He is a torturer, he is a murderer. There is no basis on which you could put Aristide in, in the name of democracy, unless you want to make democracy into a word that sounds like prostitution and murder.